

14, 15 and 19. New claims 22 and 23 have been added. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In particular, according to the Examiner, the term "based" is so broad as to include millions of compounds not disclosed or taught by Applicants specification.

Claim 5 of the U.S. patent application recites that the additive of the invention comprises terpene- or sterol-based components. This characteristic has been added to independent claims 1 and 7 with Applicants response to the Examiner's office action dated October 3, 2001. Applicants have now amended these independent claims 1 and 7: the term "based" has been deleted. Applicants have also amended these claims in such a way that they now recite in part that:

- the crystalline additive has a melting point over 80°C; and
- the components have a molecular weight of less than 1000.

Thus, it clearly appears that the compounds of the invention are very particular terpene and sterol compounds which have a particular molecular weight of less than 1000, the additive having a melting point over 80°C. As a result, independent claims 1 and 7, as well as dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12-15 and 17-20, now comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. According to the Examiner, Applicants have not taught what is meant by "based" such as the scope of the claims is not clear.

Independent claims have been amended so that the word "based" has been deleted. As a result, the scope of independent claims 1 and 7 is now clear. It is the same for dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12-15 and 17-20, depending on either claim 1 or claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tillis et al.

Applicants have deleted claim 21.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe that the present application and claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-20, 22 & 23 are in proper condition for allowance, such action is respectfully requested.

Attached hereto are marked-up and clean versions of the claims captioned "Version with markings to show changes made" and "Clean Version of the Claims" respectively.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Stephen Schlater', is written over a horizontal line.

Stephen Schlater

Reg. No. 45,081

Attorney for Applicants

Date: December 17, 2002

Schlumberger Technology Corporation

IP Dept. Well Stimulation

110 Schlumberger Drive, MD1

Ph: 281-285-4524

Fax: 281-285-8569

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW THE CHANGES MADE**

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 19 have been amended as follows:

1. A wellbore service fluid to be injected from a surface location through a well tubular into a subterranean formation, said fluid being water based and comprising a particulate additive having the properties of being crystalline, with a melting point over 80°C, soluble in hydrocarbons and insoluble in an aqueous solution, said additive comprising terpene- or sterol-based components having a molecular weight of less than 1000.
3. The wellbore fluid of claim 1, wherein the components~~additive~~ have a molecular weight of less than 650.
7. A ~~Method~~ of treating a wellbore, including the steps injecting from the surface a water based wellbore fluid comprising a particulate additive having the properties of being crystalline, with a melting point over 80°C, soluble in hydrocarbons and insoluble in an aqueous solution, said additive comprising terpene- or sterol-based components having a molecular weight of less than 1000; letting said additive accumulate at the face of a permeable formation; reversing the flow direction and letting hydrocarbons enter said wellbore through said formation thereby dissolving at least part of said accumulated additive.

9. The ~~M~~method of claim 87 wherein the ~~components~~additive hase a molecular weight of less than 650.
10. The ~~M~~method of claim 7 further comprising the step of encapsulating the additive prior to use in said wellbore fluid.
12. The ~~M~~method of claim 117 wherein the melting point of the additive is over 100°C.
13. The ~~M~~method of claim 7 wherein the size range of the particulate additive is comprised between 1 and 10000 microns.
14. The ~~M~~method of claim 7 wherein the additive comprises terpene-based components.
15. The ~~M~~method of claim 14 wherein the additive comprises Borneol or Camphor.
19. The wellbore fluid of claim 1 wherein the additive comprises terpene-based components.

Claims 22 and 23 have been added as follows:

22. The method of claim 7 wherein the additive comprises one or more components selected from the group consisting of: Borneol, Camphor, Carotene, Cholesterol, Lanosterol, Agnosterol and Lanolin.
23. The wellbore fluid of claim 1 wherein the additive comprises one of more components selected from the group consisting of: Borneol, Camphor, Carotene, Cholesterol, Lanosterol, Agnosterol and Lanolin.